



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,977	03/16/2004	Michael J. Olesko	45039.0028	2500
57362	7590	01/07/2009	EXAMINER	
AKERMAN SENTERFITT			WILHELM, TIMOTHY	
801 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N.W.				
SUITE 600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20004			3616	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/07/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/801,977	Applicant(s) OLESKO ET AL.
	Examiner Timothy D. Wilhelm	Art Unit 3616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,4,7-9,30-32 and 34 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,4,7-9,30-32 and 34 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action was made in response to an amendment filed by Applicant on 10/15/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,2,4,7,30-32, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutz et al (7,108,276) in view of Pimentel (6,576,837), and further in view of Ford (6,325,408). Schutz et al disclose a bracket for an airbag subassembly, said airbag subassembly comprising an inflator and a support structure 14, which is a steering wheel armature, said bracket comprising a base 30; an inflator opening that is positioned in an internal portion of the base 30; at least two retention members 12 that extend from said base 30 into the inflator opening, each retention member 12 having an insertion surface and a lip, a retention member 13, and a housing 20 disposed between the base 30 and the support structure 14, wherein said retention members 12 are formed integral with said base 30, wherein said retention members 12 are adapted to extend substantially perpendicular to the base 30, and wherein the inflator opening is formed between said retention members 12, and further wherein the retention members extend into the inflator opening, are stamped from the material removed to make the inflator opening, and then are bent perpendicular to the base. Schutz et al disclose the

present invention except for the retention members being curled and said retention members comprising a retention opening which penetrates curled inner and outer surfaces and communicates with a cavity extending from the base and created by the retention members, and a first engagement surface and a second engagement surface defined by side edges of said retention opening. Pimentel teaches a bracket comprising a base 64; an opening positioned in an internal portion in said base; and a plurality of retention members 74 that extend from said base into the opening, said retention members 74 being perpendicular to said base 64, wherein said retention members 74 are curled in shape to form a surface defining cavity extending perpendicular to said base. With regard to the fact that the intended use for the bracket of Pimentel is not for an airbag subassembly, section 2114 of the Manual of Patent Examination and Preparation states that "a claim containing a 'recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus' if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim." Thus, because Pimentel discloses a bracket of identical structure it reads on the claimed invention as written. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the bracket of Schutz et al with the teaching of Pimentel's curled retention members to more easily accommodate the cylindrical shape of an inflator. Ford teaches a retention member 14 for a bracket 13 for a steering wheel airbag assembly 220, wherein the retention member 14 is curved in shape, and wherein the curved surface of the retention member 14 comprises a retention opening 32 for holding the retention

member 14 in place which penetrates deeply into the curved outer surface of the retention member 14, and a first engagement surface (the upper edge of 32) and a second engagement surface (the lower edge of 32) defined by side edges of said retention opening 32. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the bracket of Schutz and Pimentel with the teaching of Ford retention opening to more securely lock the retention member in place.

3. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutz et al, Pimentel, and Ford, as applied to claims 1,2,4,7,30-32, and 34 above, and further in view of Berrahou et al (US 2004/0239080). Schutz et al, Pimentel, and Ford discloses the present invention except for the retention members being stamped from the base and each having first and second legs with each leg having an engagement surface. Berrahou et al teach a bracket for an airbag subassembly comprising a base 210 formed from a material, at least two retention members 220 extending from said base 210, said retention members 220 formed integral with and stamped from the same material as said base 210, said retention members 220 including an insertion point, a lip, and a surface formed to define a cavity extending approximately perpendicular to said base 210 (as can be seen in Fig. 6), wherein said base 210 defines an inflator opening 12 between said retention members 220, said retention members having first and second legs 226 that further define a retention cavity and a first engagement surface and a second engagement surface within said retention cavity. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify the bracket of Schutz et al, Pimentel, and Ford with the teaching of Berrahou et al's retention members to better secure the retention members.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,2,4,7-9,30-32, and 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy D. Wilhelm whose telephone number is 571-

272-6980. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Q. Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-6952. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John Q. Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3616

Timothy D Wilhelm
Examiner
Art Unit 3616

/Timothy D Wilhelm/
January 5, 2009